Jewell J. Hargleroad (SBN 130285)
Law Office of Jewell J. Hargleroad
1090 B Street, No. 104
Hayward, California 94541
(510) 331- 2975
jewellhargleroad@mac.com

Attorneys for Group Petitioners California Pilots Association. San Lorenzo Village Homes Association Hayward Area Planning Association

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE ENERGY RESOURCES

Conservation and Development Commission

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE EASTSHORE ENERGY CENTER

Docket No.: 06-AFC-6

DECLARATION OF BILL DUNN ON BEHALF OF AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION

Date: Jan. 14, 2008
Location: Hayward City Hall
Council Chambers
Time: 10 a.m.

I. Bill Dunn, hereby declare:

I. I am a resident of the state of West Virginia and have been the Vice President of Airports for the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. known as AOPA, a non-profit organization. for over sixteen years. AOPA. which is based in Frederick, Maryland, represents the general aviation interests of 414.000 members. of which 50.000 members are from California. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below and if called as a witness in this matter. would and could testify competently to the following.

2. On December 15, 2007, I wrote James S. Adams of the California Energy Commission's Environmental Office concerning the application to certify the proposed project known as the Eastshore Energy Center based on my review of the Final Staff Assessment for that

proposed project. Attached is a true and correct copy of my December 15, 7007 letter to Mr. Adams concerning AOPA's objections to detrimentally impacting the Hayward Airport, a general aviation airport included in the federal National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems and California State Airport System Plans, and a designated reliever airport for Oakland International Airport.

3. My December 15, 2007 letter represents AOPA's opinion and position on this application.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 10TH day of January, 2008, in FREDERICK, MARYLAND.

Bill Dunn

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION
421 Aviation Way • Frederick, Maryland 21701-4798
Telephone (301) 695-2000 • FAX (301) 695-2375

December 15, 2007

Mr. James S. Adams, MA
Environmental Office, MS 40
California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street
Sacramento, California 95814-5504

Subject: Eastshore Energy Center

Dear Mr. Adams:

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) represents the general aviation interests of 414,000 members, more than two-thirds of the nation's pilots-including over 50,000 members in the State of California. AOPA is committed to ensuring the future viability and economic development of general aviation airports and their facilities as part of the state and national transportation system. Any development that threatens the safety of aircraft operating near airports can be considered a threat to the viability of a local airport and the national aviation transportation system. This is especially true in highly developed metropolitan areas such as the San Francisco Bay area and Hayward, CA.

While the Association can understand the need to meet the ever-growing demands for electric energy in Northern California and Hayward, based on the information we have reviewed regarding the above referenced project, AOPA is strongly opposed to approval and construction of the Eastshore Energy Center at the currently proposed location which is roughly one-mile from Hayward Executive Airport (HWD). HWD, with over 477-based aircraft and nearly 125,000 operations each year, is a major reliever airport in the Bay Area.

We believe that the Staff Assessment clearly demonstrates and identifies a number of potential safety impacts to aviation operations and that thermal plumes generated by the facility could create hazards to aircraft operating into and out of the Hayward Executive Airport.

The staff report, issued in October 2007 under Land Use at page 4.5-2, states:

> "The cumulative effect of the Eastshore and nearby Russell City Energy Center (RCEC) projects on Hayward airport airspace increases the potential for serious impairment to the utility of the airport be effectively limiting the use of a significant portion of the airport's usable airspace and has the potential to interfere with or unduly restrict existing or future use of the Hayward Executive Airport. Therefore, Energy Commission staff concludes that the project could, in conjunction with construction of the proposed RCEC project, have a significant adverse environmental impact that could not be avoided if the project is implemented."

The report, in this same section also states:

> "However, Energy Commission staff has concluded that the project would result in significant adverse indirect and cumulative impacts by interfering with or unduly restricting the existing and future uses of the Hayward Executive Airport and the surrounding airspace. This impact cannot be avoided or mitigated if the project is implemented at the proposed location, or anywhere within the airspace of the Hayward Executive Airport. In addition, the project does not conform to the purposed of several City of Hayward LORS, as indicated above." [emphasis added]

We believe, and the staff report support his belief, that the Eastshore proposal is inconsistent with City of Hayward Airport Approach Zone Plan as codified in Hayward Municipal Code § 10-6.00 as well as the Alameda County Airport Land Use Plan.

We are particularly concerned that while local pilots may be familiar with the facility if it is constructed, over flights from transient aircraft unfamiliar with the facility will occur.

Additionally, during certain atmospheric conditions, vapor plumes created by this plant will create turbulent conditions for aircraft that over fly the site either on approach to HWD or another airport in the same geographic area. Such vapor plumes will also have an impact on visual navigation equipment used for navigation to the airport under either visual or instrument conditions.

A similar generation facility is located approximately the same overall distance (approximately 1 mile) from the Blythe, California airport. Our members have reported to us the same detrimental effect on their ability to land safely at that airport. Aircraft have experienced flight "upsets" due to turbulence encountered while over flying the exhaust stacks of that facility. It is our understanding that a number of mitigation measures promised by the proponent of the Blythe site was never implemented as promised.

The FAA Flight Procedure Standards Branch, AFS-400, has issued a report on "Safety Rick Analysis of Aircraft Overflight of Industrial Exhaust Plumes." In January 2006, this study was issued as a report and published under Safety Study Report DOT-FAA-AFS-420-06-1.

In summary, the report indicated:

> *The underlying presumption is that high efflux temperature or velocity from industrial facilities may cause air disturbances via exhaust plumes. Two hazards were identified during brainstorming sessions by members of the safety risk analysis team.*

> *The first hazard recognized turbulence that may be associated with plumes that could result in possible airframe damage and/or negative affects on aircraft stability in flight. The second hazard discussed was the possible adverse effects of high levels of water vapor, engine/aircraft contaminants, icing, and restricted visibilities produced by these plumes. These hazards taken individually or cumulatively, could possibly result in the loss of the aircraft or fatal injury to the crew, as well as substantial damage to ground facilities. The SME team considered these situations to be most critical for general aviation (GA) aircraft flying at low altitudes during the takeoff and/or landing phase when an aircraft is in close proximity to an airport. The safety risk analysis team performed their analysis of the predictive risks associated with the plumes and determined the effects of the hazards as low, or in the green section of the risk matrix.*

The consequences of even one aircraft being upset by the thermal plumes and resulting in incident or accident could affect the lives of the aircraft occupants and people on the ground. Such an unfortunate occurrence would undoubtedly lead to attempts to restrict operations at the airport, or worse, attempts to close the airport.

We would like to raise one additional issue that does not appear to have been addressed and that is one of liability exposure. If this project is built as proposed, the proponent and owner of the facility may well face extensive exposure to litigation claims should an incident or accident occur that can be linked to operation of this facility.

In closing, we again respectfully request that the Commission reject approval of this project. While we clearly understand the need for development of energy to serve the public, we recommend another location that will not have a detrimental safety impact on aircraft operations in the Bay Area and at Hayward Executive Airport specifically.

Sincerely,

Bill Dunn
Vice President
Airports